arXiv:1409.4028v1 [math.OC] 14 Sep 2014

OPTIMAL CONTROL OF MARKOV PROCESSES WITH AGE-DEPENDENT TRANSITION RATES *

Mrinal K. Ghosh†, Subhamay Saha‡

Abstract

We study optimal control of Markov processes with age-dependent transition rates. The control policy is chosen continuously over time based on the state of the process and its age. We study infinite horizon discounted cost and infinite horizon average cost problems. Our approach is via the construction of an equivalent semi-Markov decision process. We characterise the value function and optimal controls for both discounted and average cost cases.

Key Words : Age-dependent transition rates, semi-Markov decision process, infinite horizon discounted cost, infinite horizon average cost.

Mathematics Subject Classification: 93E20, 60J75.

1 Introduction

We address optimal control of Markov processes in continuous time taking values in a countable state space. The simplest example of such a process is controlled Markov chains also known as continuous time Markov decision process (CTMDP). The study of controlled Markov chains is quite well developed [3], [8], [9], [14]; in particular see [7] and the references therein. For a continuous time controlled Markov chain, for each control input the holding time or sojourn time in each state is exponentially distributed. Thus for a fixed input the sojourn times are memoryless. If the sojourn time in each state is given by a general distribution (other than exponential) then the process is referred to as a semi-Markov process. A controlled semi-Markov process, also known as semi-Markov decision process(SMDP), is determined by a controlled transition kernel and controlled holding time distributions. This class of processes are usually studied via the embedded controlled Markov chain [4], [5], [16]. Since in an SMDP the holding time distributions have a memory, the age of the process in a particular state influences the residual time in that state. It may, however,

*This work is supported in part by SPM fellowship of CSIR and in part by UGC Centre for Advanced Study.

†Department of Mathematics, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore-12, India, email: mkg@math.iisc.ernet.in

‡Department of Mathematics, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore-12, India, email: subhamay@math.iisc.ernet.in

be noted that the age has no influence in determining the next state; nor does it play any role in the decision making. There are several situations in which the age of the process is crucial in the overall decision making process. To illustrate this point we consider two examples.

Consider a queueing system with controllable arrival and service rates. Suppose the queue capacity is infinite. The decision maker can dynamically select the service rates between the bounds $0 < \mu_1 < \mu_2 < \infty$ depending on the number of persons in the queue and for how long that many persons are in the queue. Moreover, the arrival rates can also be adjusted between $0 < \gamma_1 < \gamma_2 < \infty$. The cost structure consists of three parts: a holding cost rate function $b(i, y)$ where i is the number of customers and y is the amount of time for which there has been i customers, an income rate $b_1(\gamma)$ when an arrival rate γ is maintained and a service cost rate $b_2(\mu)$ when the service rate is μ. Mathematically the model can be described as below:

$$S = \{0, 1, 2, \cdots\} : \text{ state space.}$$

$$U = [\gamma_1, \gamma_2] \times [\mu_1, \mu_2] : \text{ control set.}$$

$$\lambda_{ij}(y, \gamma, \mu) = \begin{cases} \gamma \text{ for } j = i + 1 \\ \mu \text{ for } j = i - 1 \\ 0 \text{ otherwise} \end{cases} : \text{ transition rates.}$$

$$c(i, y, \gamma, \mu) = b(i, y) - b_1(\gamma) + b_2(\mu) : \text{ cost function.}$$

Next consider a device which is subject to shocks that occur randomly in time according to a Poisson process with controllable rate. Every shock causes a damage to the machine. The damage caused depends on the state of the machine and the amount of time it has been in that state. The machine can be in the states $0, 1, 2, \cdots, N$. The state 0 represents the new machine and once the machine goes to state N, then a further shock would mean that a new machine has to be installed. Suppose the rate of arrival of shocks can be adjusted between $0 < \mu_1 < \mu_2 < \infty$. The cost structure consists of two parts: an operational cost rate $b(i, y)$ is incurred if the machine is in state i and the age in that state is y, and a maintenance rate $b_1(\mu)$ when the shock arrival rate is μ. Mathematically, the model can be described as below:

$$S = \{0, 1, \cdots, N\}.$$

$$U = [\mu_1, \mu_2].$$

$$\lambda_{ij}(y,\mu) = \begin{cases} \frac{\mu}{1+y} \text{ for } j = i+1, i \leq N-2 \\ \frac{\mu y}{1+y} \text{ for } j = i+2, i \leq N-2 \\ \mu \text{ for } i = N-1, j = N \text{ and } i = N, j = 0 \, . \end{cases}$$

$$c(i,y,\mu) = b(i,y) + b_1(\mu) \, .$$

Motivated by the above two examples we study optimal control of Markov processes where the transition rates are age dependent. Informally, this means if the process is in state i and its age in the state is y, then the probability that in an infinitesimal time dt the process will jump to state j is $\lambda_{ij}(y)dt$ plus a small error term. The probability that after an infinitesimal time dt it will still be in state i is $1 - \sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_{ij}(y)dt$ plus some error term, where λ_{ij} are some measurable functions referred to as transition rates. In controlled case the transition rates also depends on the control parameter chosen dynamically based on the state and the age. In continuous time Markov chain the transition rates are constant with respect to the age. In semi-Markov case the transition rates are given by $\lambda_{ij}(y) = p_{ij} \frac{f(y|i)}{1-F(y|i)}$, where p_{ij}s are the transition probabilities and F is the holding time distributions with density f. In CTMDP and SMDP when the controller is using a stationary control, he or she takes decision only on the basis of state and it is independent of the age. But in our case the decision maker takes his actions based on both the state and the age. Thus the decision maker, unlike in CTMDP and SMDP, has the liberty to take actions between jumps even when he or she is using a stationary control. This liberty can be of great advantage in practical situations. Hence our model may be more effective in many practical situations.

We now present a formal description of the controlled process. A rigorous construction of the process is given in the next section. Let $S = \{0, 1, 2, \cdots\}$ be the state space and U a compact metric space, which is the control set.

For $i, j \in S$ with $i \neq j$ suppose

$$\lambda_{ij} : [0, \infty) \times U \to [0, \infty)$$

are given measurable functions. Consider a controlled process $\{(X_t, Y_t)\}$ which satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \mathbb{P}(X_{t+h} = j, Y_{t+h} = 0 \,|\, X_t = i, Y_t = y, U_t = u) = \lambda_{ij}(y,u)h + o(h) \\ \mathbb{P}(X_{t+h} = j, Y_{t+h} = y + h \,|\, X_t = i, Y_t = y, U_t = u) = 1 - \sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_{ij}(y,u)h + o(h) \, . \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

We call $\{X_t\}$ the state process, $\{Y_t\}$ the associated age process and $\{U_t\}$ is the control process which is a U-valued process satisfying certain technical conditions. The control process is chosen based on both the state and its age. Thus the control action is taken continuously over time. Equation (1.1) implies that at time t if the state is i, and its age in the state is y and the control chosen is u then $\lambda_{ij}(y,u)$ is the the infinitesimal jump rate to state j.

The main aim in a stochastic optimal control problem is to find a control policy which minimises a given cost functional. Let

$$c : S \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times U \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$$

be the running cost function. Suppose the planning horizon is infinite and consider the discounted cost problem. We seek to minimise

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} c(X_t, Y_t, U_t) dt$$

over the set of all admissible controls (to be defined in the next section), where $\alpha > 0$ is the discount factor. We also study the long-run average cost on the infinite horizon.

We now briefly comment on some earlier work leading to ours. Hordijk et al. [10, 11, 12] have studied Markov drift decision processes which is an important generalisation of semi-Markov decision processes. However, in their work though the state drifts according to a specified drift function between jumps, no action is taken during the period. There is another important class of controlled processes namely piecewise deterministic processes(PDP) [1], where decisions are taken between jumps as well. But in PDP the importance of age has not been emphasized.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 we use the idea in [6] to give a rigorous construction of the process $\{(X_t, Y_t)\}$ which is based on a representation of $\{(X_t, Y_t)\}$ as stochastic integrals with respect to an appropriate Poisson random measure. In Section 3 we study the infinite horizon discounted cost problem. For that we construct an equivalent semi-Markov process. Section 4 deals with the infinite horizon average cost case.

2 Mathematical Model and Preliminaries

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be the underlying probability space. For $i, j \in S, i \neq j$, let

$$\lambda_{ij} : [0, \infty) \times U \to [0, \infty)$$

be given measurable functions. Set

$$\lambda_{ii}(y, u) = -\sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_{ij}(y, u) \ .$$

We make the following assumption which is in force throughout this paper:

(A1) There exists a constant M such that

$$\sup_{i \in S, y \geq 0, u \in U} \{-\lambda_{ii}(y, u)\} < M \ .$$

(A2) $\inf_{i\in S, y\geq 0, u\in U}\{-\lambda_{ii}(y,u)\} > m$ for some $m > 0$.

For technical reasons we introduce relaxed control framework. Let $\mathcal{P}(U)$ denote the set of probability measures on U. For $i \neq j$, let $\tilde{\lambda}_{ij} : [0,\infty) \times \mathcal{P}(U) \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be defined by

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{ij}(y,\nu) = \int_U \lambda_{ij}(y,u)\nu(du)\,.$$

For $i \neq j$, $y \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(U)$, let $\Lambda_{ij}(y,\nu)$ be consecutive right open, left closed intervals of the real line of length $\tilde{\lambda}_{ij}(y,\nu)$.

We define a function $h : S \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathcal{P}(U) \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$h(i,y,\nu,z) = \begin{cases} j-i & \text{if } z \in \Lambda_{ij}(y,\nu) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}\,. \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

We also define a function $g : S \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathcal{P}(U) \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$g(i,y,\nu,z) = \begin{cases} y & \text{if } z \in \bigcup\limits_j \Lambda_{ij}(y,\nu) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}\,. \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

Let $\wp(ds,dz)$ be a Poisson random measure on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}$ with intensity measure $ds \times dz$, the product Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}$.

Consider the following stochastic differential equation

$$\begin{cases} X_t = X_0 + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} h_1(X_{s-}, Y_{s-}, U_s, z)\wp(ds,dz) \\ Y_t = Y_0 + t - \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} h_2(X_{s-}, Y_{s-}, U_s, z)\wp(ds,dz) \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

where $\{U_t\}$ is a $\mathcal{P}(U)$-valued process with measurable sample paths which is predictable with respect to the filtration given by

$$\sigma(\wp(A\times B) : A \in \mathcal{B}([0,s]), B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}), s \leq t)$$

and X_0, Y_0 are random variables with prescribed laws independent of the Poisson random measure. The integrals in (2.3) are over $(0,t]$. From the results in [13, Chap IV, p. 231] it follows that for each $\{U_t\}$ as above, equation (2.3) has an a.s unique strong solution $\{(X_t,Y_t)\}$. If $U_t = \mathbf{u}(t, X_{t-}, Y_{t-})$ for some measurable function $\mathbf{u} : [0,\infty) \times S \times [0,\infty) \to \mathcal{P}(U)$ then U is called a Markov control. Moreover if $U_t = \mathbf{u}(X_{t-}, Y_{t-})$ for some measurable function $\mathbf{u} : S \times [0,\infty) \to \mathcal{P}(U)$ then U is referred to as stationary Markov control. It is customary in optimal control literature to refer to the function $\mathbf{u}$ as the control. We denote by $\mathcal{U}$ the set of all measurable functions $\mathbf{u} : S \times [0,\infty) \to \mathcal{P}(U)$. In this paper we restrict our set of controls to the set $\mathcal{U}$ and we refer to $\mathcal{U}$ as the set of admissible controls. For each $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}$, $\{(X_t,Y_t)\}$ is a strong Markov process. Let $f : S \times \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}$ be continuously

differentiable in the second variable. Then applying Itô's formula to f we can show that the generator of the process $\{(X_t, Y_t)\}$ denoted by $\mathcal{A}^{\mathbf{u}}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{A}^{\mathbf{u}} f(i,y) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(i,y) + \sum_{j \neq i} \tilde{\lambda}_{ij}(t,y,\mathbf{u}(i,y))[f(j,0) - f(i,y)] \,. \tag{2.4}$$

3 Infinite Horizon Discounted case

Let

$$c : S \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times U \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$$

be the running cost function. Define $\tilde{c} : S \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathcal{P}(U) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ by

$$\tilde{c}(i,y,\nu) = \int_U c(i,y,u)\nu(du).$$

Let $\alpha > 0$ be the discount factor. Then for $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}$ the infinite horizon discounted cost is given by

$$J_\alpha^{\mathbf{u}}(i) = E_{i,0}^{\mathbf{u}} \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} \tilde{c}(X_t, Y_t, \mathbf{u}(X_t, Y_t))dt \tag{3.1}$$

where $E_{i,0}^{\mathbf{u}}$ denotes the expectation when the control $\mathbf{u}$ is used and $X_0 = i, Y_0 = 0$. The objective is to minimise $J_\alpha^{\mathbf{u}}(i)$ over all admissible controls. So we define

$$V_\alpha(i) = \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}} J_\alpha^{\mathbf{u}}(i) \,. \tag{3.2}$$

The function V_α is called the (α-discounted) value function. An admissible control $\mathbf{u}^* \in \mathcal{U}$ is called (α-discounted) optimal if

$$J_\alpha^{\mathbf{u}^*}(i) = V_\alpha(i).$$

We carry out our study under the following assumptions :

(A3) λ_{ij}s $(j \neq i)$ are jointly continuous in y and u and the sum $\sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_{ij}(y,u)$ converges uniformly for each i.

(A4) The cost function c is continuous in the second and third variable and there exists a finite constant $\tilde{C}$ such that

$$\sup_{i,y,u} c(i,y,u) \leq \tilde{C} \,.$$

The boundedness of c implies that $V_\alpha(i)$ is well defined for each i and

$$\sup_i V_\alpha(i) \leq \frac{\tilde{C}}{\alpha} \,.$$

In order to characterise the value function and the optimal control we construct an equivalent semi-Markov decision process. In order to do so the key observation here is that between jumps the trajectory of the process $\{(X_t, Y_t)\}$ is deterministic. Thus $\{(X_t, Y_t)\}$ is a piecewise deterministic process [1]. Therefore a stationary relaxed control is equivalent to that of choosing a function $r : [0, \infty) \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}(U)$ at each jump time. More explicitly suppose the process jumps to a state $(i, 0)$, then we choose the function r_i given by $r_i(y) = \mathbf{u}(i, y)$.

Let

$$\mathcal{R} = \{r \,|\, r : [0, \infty) \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}(U),\, measurable\}$$

This set $\mathcal{R}$ will be the action space for an equivalent semi-Markov decision process that we are going to construct. First we give a topology on $\mathcal{R}$. Let $V = L^1([0, \infty); C(U))$, where $C(U)$ is space of continuous functions on U endowed with the supremum norm.. Thus V is the space of integrable (with respect to Lebesgue measure) $C(U)$-valued functions on $[0, \infty)$. Then the dual of V is $V^* = L^\infty([0, \infty); M(U))$, where $M(U)$ is the space of complex Borel regular measures on U with the total variation norm. Now by Banach-Alaoglu theorem the unit ball of V^* is weak* compact. Hence $\mathcal{R}$ being a closed subset of the unit ball of V^*, is a compact metric space (for more details see [1, Chap 4, p. 149]). In this topology, $r^n \longrightarrow r$ if and only if

$$\int_{[0,\infty)} \int_U f(y, u) r_y^n(du)dy \longrightarrow \int_{[0,\infty)} \int_U f(y, u) r_y(du)dy$$

for all $f \in V$.

Now define $f : S \times \mathcal{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ by

$$f(i, r) = \int_0^\infty \left(\exp(-\alpha y) \exp\{-\int_0^y \int_U \sum_{k \neq i} \lambda_{ik}(s, u) r_s(du)ds\} \int_U c(i, y, u) r_y(du) \right) dy\,. \tag{3.3}$$

For $r \in \mathcal{R}$ define a transition matrix by

$$\hat{p}_{ij}(r) = \int_0^\infty \left(\exp\{-\int_0^y \int_U \sum_{k \neq i} \lambda_{ik}(s, u) r_s(du)ds\} \int_U \lambda_{ij}(y, u) r_y(du) \right) dy\,. \tag{3.4}$$

Finally for $r \in \mathcal{R}$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ define a family of distribution functions by

$$F_{ij}^r(t) = \frac{\int_0^t \left(\exp\{-\int_0^y \int_U \sum_{k \neq i} \lambda_{ik}(s, u) r_s(du)ds\} \int_U \lambda_{ij}(y, u) r_y(du) \right) dy}{\hat{p}_{ij}(r)}\,. \tag{3.5}$$

Now consider a semi-Markov decision process with state space S, action space $\mathcal{R}$, expected one stage cost f given by (3.3), transition probabilities $(\hat{p}_{ij}(r))$ given by (3.4) and sojourn time distributions F_{ij}^r given by (3.5). In short the dynamics of the process is as follows: Suppose the initial state is $i \in S$ and the decision maker chooses an action r from the set $\mathcal{R}$. The action depends on the

state. Because of this action the decision maker has to pay a cost up to the next jump time at a rate dependent on the state and the action chosen. The next state is j with probability $\hat{p}_{ij}(r)$ and conditioned on the event that the next state is j, the distribution of the sojourn time in the state i is given by F_{ij}^r. The aim of the decision maker is to minimize the cost over the set of stationary policies $\pi : S \longrightarrow \mathcal{R}$.

Define

$$\widetilde{J}_\alpha^\pi(i) = \mathbb{E}_i^\pi \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-\alpha(\tau_0+\tau_1+\cdots+\tau_n)} \int_0^{\tau_{n+1}} e^{-\alpha y} \left(\int_U c(X_{T_n}, y, u) \pi_{X_{T_n}}(y)(du) \right) dy \tag{3.6}$$

where T_n is the nth jump time and $\tau_n = T_n - T_{n-1}$. Let

$$\tilde{V}_\alpha(i) = \inf_\pi \widetilde{J}_\alpha^\pi(i).$$

Thus $\tilde{V}_\alpha$ is the value function for the SMDP. Now corresponding to a control $\mathbf{u}$ of the original optimal control problem, define the policy $\pi^{\mathbf{u}}$ for the semi-Markov decision process by

$$\pi_i^{\mathbf{u}}(y) = \mathbf{u}(i, y).$$

Then it follows from the definition of the semi-Markov decision process that

$$\begin{aligned}
J_\alpha^{\mathbf{u}}(i) &= \mathbb{E}_{i,0}^{\mathbf{u}} \big[\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int_{T_n}^{T_{n+1}} e^{-\alpha t} \tilde{c}(X_t, Y_t, \mathbf{u}(X_t, Y_t)) dt \big] \\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{i,0}^{\mathbf{u}} \big[\mathbb{E}_{i,0}^{\mathbf{u}} \big[\int_{T_n}^{T_{n+1}} e^{-\alpha t} \tilde{c}(X_t, Y_t, \mathbf{u}(X_t, Y_t)) dt | H_n \big] \big] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_i^{\pi^{\mathbf{u}}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-\alpha(\tau_0+\tau_1+\cdots+\tau_n)} \int_0^{\tau_{n+1}} e^{-\alpha y} \left(\int_U c(X_{T_n}, y, u) \pi_{X_{T_n}}^{\mathbf{u}}(y)(du) \right) dy \\
&= \widetilde{J}_\alpha^{\pi^{\mathbf{u}}}(i)
\end{aligned}$$

where H_n is the history upto the nth jump time. On the other hand corresponding to a policy π of the SMDP define the control $\mathbf{u}^\pi$ for the original optimal control problem by

$$\mathbf{u}^\pi(i, y) = \pi_i(y).$$

Again

$$J_\alpha^{\mathbf{u}^\pi}(i) = \tilde{J}_\alpha^\pi(i).$$

Hence it follows that

$$V_\alpha(i) = \widetilde{V}_\alpha(i). \tag{3.7}$$

The equation (3.7) establishes the equivalence between the original control problem and the constructed semi-Markov decision process.

Thus in order to evaluate $V_\alpha(i)$, we analyse the the equivalent semi-Markov decision process. As a first step we state the following useful lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Under (A1) - (A4), the functions $f(i,.)$, $\hat{p}_{ij}(.)$ and $F_{ij}^{(.)}(t_0)$ are continuous on $\mathcal{R}$.*

Proof. Suppose r^n converges to r in $\mathcal{R}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}|f(i,r_n) - f(i,r)| \leq \tilde{C}\int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t}\big|e^{-\int_0^t\int_U\sum_{k\neq i}\lambda_{ik}(s,u)r_s^n(du)ds} - e^{-\int_0^t\int_U\sum_{k\neq i}\lambda_{ik}(s,u)r_s(du)ds}\big|dt \\ + \left|\int_0^\infty\int_U e^{-\alpha t}e^{-\int_0^t\int_U\sum_{k\neq i}\lambda_{ik}(s,u)r_s(du)ds}c(i,t,u)r_t^n(du)dt - \right. \\ \left. \int_0^\infty\int_U e^{-\alpha t}e^{-\int_0^t\int_U\sum_{k\neq i}\lambda_{ik}(s,u)r_s(du)ds}c(i,t,u)r_t(du)dt\right|.\end{aligned}$$

By the definition of convergence in $\mathcal{R}$, both the terms on the right hand side of the above expression go to 0 as $n\to\infty$. Similar arguments hold for the other two functions as well. □

Thus using the equivalence of the semi-Markov decision process described above and the original control problem, we obtain the following result from the standard theory of SMDP [15].

Theorem 3.1. *Assume (A1) - (A4). Then the value function V_α is the unique bounded solution of*

$$\phi(i) = \min_{r\in\mathcal{R}}\big[f(i,r) + \sum_{j\neq i}\hat{p}_{ij}(r)\int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t}\phi(j)dF_{ij}^r(t)\big] \tag{3.8}$$

Furthermore if r_i^* is the minimizer of the right hand side of (3.8) *(which exists by the previous lemma and compactness of $\mathcal{R}$), then the control given by $\boldsymbol{u}^*(i,y) = r_i^*(y)$ is an optimal control for the original control problem.*

Remark 3.1. *The reason for restricting to only stationary controls is evident from our approach. For setting a bijection between the set of controls of the original control problem and the equivalent SMDP, we need the restriction on the set of admissible controls. For a Markov control it is not clear that such a bijection can be established. Because in CTMDP as well as in SMDP, the optimal control is finally given by a stationary control, this restriction is not unnatural.*

4 Infinite Horizon Average Cost

Now we investigate the infinite horizon average cost cost problem via the equivalent semi-Markov decision process approach. First we describe the infinite horizon average cost control problem for

the original control problem. For $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}$ define

$$J^{\mathbf{u}}(i) = \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}^{\mathbf{u}}_{i,0} \int_0^{T_n} \int_U c(X_t, Y_t, u)\mathbf{u}(X_t, Y_t)(du)dt}{\mathbb{E}^{\mathbf{u}}_{i,0} T_n},$$

where T_n is the nth jump time. The aim of the controller is to minimise $J^{\mathbf{u}}$ over all $\mathbf{u}$.

Now consider the semi-Markov decision process defined in the previous section with the expected one-stage (jump to jump) cost in state i given by

$$\varphi(i, r) = \int_0^\infty \left(\exp\{-\int_0^y \int_U \sum_{k\neq i} \lambda_{ik}(s, u) r_s(du)ds\} \int_U c(i, y, u) r_y(du) \right) dy\,.$$

where $r \in \mathcal{R}$ is the action chosen in state i.

Now define

$$\tilde{J}^\pi(i) = \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}^\pi_i Z(T_n)}{\mathbb{E}^\pi_i (T_n)},$$

where

$$Z(T_n) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \int_0^{\tau_{k+1}} \int_U c(X_{T_k}, y, u)\pi_{X_{T_k}}(y)(du)dy$$

is the cost incurred up to the nth jump time.

By arguments analogous to the discounted case we have

$$\inf_{\mathbf{u}} J^{\mathbf{u}}(i) = \inf_{\pi} \tilde{J}^\pi(i).$$

Let $\bar{\tau}(i, r)$ be the expected sojourn time of the equivalent semi-Markov decision process in state i, when the action chosen is r. Thus

$$\bar{\tau}(i, r) = \int_0^\infty \exp\{-\int_0^t \int_U \sum_{j\neq i} \lambda_{ij}(y, u) r_y(du)dy\}dt\,.$$

Consider the equation

$$\psi(i) = \inf_{r\in\mathcal{R}} [\varphi(i, r) + \sum_{j\neq i} \hat{p}_{ij}(r)\psi(j) - \rho\bar{\tau}(i, r)] \tag{4.1}$$

where $\psi : S \to \mathbb{R}$ and ρ is a scalar.

Using the equivalence and the theory of SMDP [15], we obtain the following result:

Theorem 4.1. *If* (4.1) *has a solution* (h, g)*, where* h *is a bounded function, then* g *is the optimal average cost for the original control problem and an optimal policy is given by* $\boldsymbol{u}^*(i, y) = r^*_i(y)$ *where* r^*_i *is given by*

$$[\varphi(i, r^*_i) + \sum_{j\neq i} \hat{p}_{ij}(r^*_i)h(j) - g\bar{\tau}(i, r^*_i)] = \inf_{r\in\mathcal{R}} [\varphi(i, r) + \sum_{j\neq i} \hat{p}_{ij}(r)h(j) - g\bar{\tau}(i, r)]\,.$$

Now we give conditions explicit conditions on λ_{ij} which will ensure the existence of a bounded solution of (4.1). We make two additional assumptions:

(A5) S is a finite set.

(A6) The exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\lambda_{i0}(y,u) > \delta$ for all $i(\neq 0), y, u$ and for $j \neq 0$ if $\sup_{y,u} \lambda_{ij}(y,u) > 0$, then $\inf_{y,u} \lambda_{ij}(y,u) > 0$.

Remark 4.1. *Note that even though S is finite, the effective state space is $S \times \mathbb{R}_+$ which is uncountable.*

Now we give an example where our assumptions are true.

Example 4.1. *We modify the second example in the introduction. Let λ_{ij} be modified as follows:*

For $i \leq N-3$,

$$\lambda_{iN}(y,\mu) = \frac{\mu}{10^{N-i}}\,.$$

$$\lambda_{ii+1}(y,\mu) = \begin{cases} \mu - \frac{2\mu}{10^{N-i}} & \text{for } y \leq 100 \\ \frac{\mu}{10^{N-i}} & \text{for } y \geq 1000 \\ \text{linear in between}\,. \end{cases}$$

$$\lambda_{ii+2}(y,\mu) = \mu - \frac{\mu}{10^{N-i}} - \lambda_{ii+1}(y,\mu)\,.$$

$$\lambda_{N-2N-1}(y,\mu) = \begin{cases} \mu - \frac{2\mu}{10^2} & \text{for } y \leq 100 \\ \frac{2\mu}{10^2} & \text{for } y \geq 1000 \\ \text{linear in between}\,. \end{cases}$$

$$\lambda_{N-2N}(y,\mu) = \mu - \lambda_{N-2N-1}(y,\mu)\,.$$

$$\lambda_{N-1N}(y,\mu) = \mu\,.$$

$$\lambda_{N0}(y,\mu) = \mu\,.$$

Clearly this example satisfies (A5) and (A6) with N playing the role of 0.

For $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}$ it follows from (A6) that the transition probabilities of the embedded Markov chain $\{X_{T_n}\}$ where T_n are the successive jump times, satisfy:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{p}^{\mathbf{u}}_{i0} &= \int_0^\infty \tilde{\lambda}_{i0}(y, \mathbf{u}(i,y)) \exp\big(-\int_0^y \sum_{j\neq i} \tilde{\lambda}_{ij}(s, \mathbf{u}(i,s))ds\big)dy \\ &\geq \delta \int_0^\infty \exp(-My)dy \\ &= \frac{\delta}{M}\,. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that in the embedded Markov chain, the expected number of steps taken to reach 0 starting from any state i is finite, i.e., if

$$N = \min\{n \geq 1 | X_{T_n} = 0\}$$

then

$$\sup_{\mathbf{u}\in\mathcal{U}} \mathbb{E}_i^{\mathbf{u}} N < \infty\,. \tag{4.2}$$

Also by (A6) it follows that if $\hat{p}_{ij}^{\mathbf{u}} \neq 0$ then $\inf_{\mathbf{u}\in\mathcal{U}} \hat{p}_{ij}^{\mathbf{u}} > 0$.

Let

$$\tau_0 = \inf\{t > 0 | (X_t, Y_t) = (0,0)\}\,. \tag{4.3}$$

Lemma 4.1. *Under (A1)-(A3), (A5)-(A6) we have*

$$\sup_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbb{E}_{i,0}^{\mathbf{u}} \tau_0 < \infty, \tag{4.4}$$

where τ_0 is as in (4.3).

Proof. Let δ_n denote the set of sequences of states $(i_0, i_1, \cdots, i_n)$ such that

$$i_0 = i$$

$$i_j \neq 0 \quad \text{for} \quad j = 1, 2, \cdots, n-1$$

$$i_n = 0.$$

Then

$$\mathbb{E}_{i,0}^{\mathbf{u}} \tau_0 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{(i_0,i_1,\cdots,i_n)\in\delta_n} \prod \hat{p}_{i_k,i_{k+1}}^{\mathbf{u}} (\eta_{i_0 i_1}^{\mathbf{u}} + \cdots + \eta_{i_{n-1} i_n}^{\mathbf{u}})$$

where $\eta_{ij}^{\mathbf{u}}$ is the expected amount of time spent in state i given that the next transition will be into state j. Therefore

$$\mathbb{E}_{i,0}^{\mathbf{u}} \tau_0 \leq (\max_{j,k\in S} \eta_{jk}^{\mathbf{u}}) \mathbb{E}_i^{\mathbf{u}} N\,.$$

Using (A6) and the fact that the expected sojourn times in each state is finite it follows that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{u}\in\mathcal{U}} (\max_{j,k\in S} \eta_{jk}^{\mathbf{u}}) < \infty.$$

Note that for the above the finiteness of the state space is crucial. Hence the desired result follows by (4.2). □

Lemma 4.2. *For $\alpha > 0$, let $h_\alpha(i) = V_\alpha(i) - V_\alpha(0)$. Then the family $\{h_\alpha\}_{\alpha>0}$ is uniformly bounded.*

Proof. Let K be a constant such that $\max_i \sup_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbf{u}}_{i,0}\tau_0 < K$. If $\mathbf{u}^*_\alpha$ denotes the optimal policy for the $\alpha-$discounted case then we have,

$$\begin{aligned} V_\alpha(i) =& \mathbb{E}^{\mathbf{u}^*_\alpha}_{i,0}\Big[\int_0^{\tau_0} e^{-\alpha t}\tilde{c}(X_t, Y_t, \mathbf{u}^*_\alpha(X_t, Y_t))dt \\ &+ \int_{\tau_0}^{\infty} e^{-\alpha t}\tilde{c}(X_t, Y_t, \mathbf{u}^*_\alpha(X_t, Y_t))dt\Big] \\ &\leq \tilde{C}K + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbf{u}^*_\alpha}_{i,0} e^{-\alpha\tau_0} V_\alpha(0) \\ &\leq \tilde{C}K + V_\alpha(0)\ . \end{aligned}$$

Again,

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbf{u}^*_\alpha}_{i,0} e^{-\alpha\tau_0} V_\alpha(0) \leq V_\alpha(i)$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} V_\alpha(0) &\leq V_\alpha(i) + \big(1 - \mathbb{E}^{\mathbf{u}^*_\alpha}_{i,0} e^{-\alpha\tau_0}\big) V_\alpha(0) \\ &\leq V_\alpha(i) + \big(1 - e^{-\alpha K}\big)\frac{\tilde{C}}{\alpha} \\ &\leq V_\alpha(i) + K\tilde{C}\ . \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality follows from Jensen's inequality.

Thus we have

$$|h_\alpha(i)| \leq K\tilde{C}\,.$$

□

Theorem 4.2. *Under (A1)-(A6), the equation* (4.1) *has a solution (h, g) where h is a bounded function and g is a scalar.*

Proof. Let $\tilde{h}_\alpha(i) = \tilde{V}_\alpha(i) - \tilde{V}_\alpha(0)$. Then by Lemma 4.2 and (3.7), it follows that the family $\{\tilde{h}_\alpha(i)\}$ is uniformly bounded. Therefore there exists a sequence $\alpha_n \to 0$ such that

$$g = \lim_{\alpha_n \to 0} \alpha_n \tilde{V}_{\alpha_n}(0)$$

$$h(i) = \lim_{\alpha_n \to 0} \tilde{h}_{\alpha_n}(i)$$

where h is a bounded function. Now using standard arguments [15], it can be shown that the pair (g, h) satisfies (4.1). □

Remark 4.2. *If $\{X_t^{\boldsymbol{u}}\}$ is irreducible for each $\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{U}$, i.e., if the embedded Markov chain is irreducible then*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}_{i,0}^{\boldsymbol{u}} \int_0^{T_n} \int_U c(X_t, Y_t, u)\boldsymbol{u}(X_t, Y_t)(du)dt}{\mathbb{E}_{i,0}^{\boldsymbol{u}} T_n} = \limsup_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T}\mathbb{E}_{i,0}^{\boldsymbol{u}} \int_0^T \int_U c(X_t, Y_t, u)\boldsymbol{u}(X_t, Y_t)(du)dt\,.$$

Thus if the irreducibility assumption holds, then g of the above theorem satisfies

$$g = \limsup_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T}\mathbb{E}_{i,0}^{\boldsymbol{u}} \int_0^T \int_U c(X_t, Y_t, u)\boldsymbol{u}(X_t, Y_t)(du)dt\,.$$

5 Conclusions

We have studied optimal control problems for a class Markov processes with age dependent transitions rates which subsumes semi-Markov decision processes with the holding time distributions having densities. We have allowed control actions between jumps based on the age of the process. We have constructed an equivalent SMDP which yields the relevant results for the original problem. A standard approach towards solving an optimal control problem is via the HJB equation. In our problem the HJB equation for the discounted cost case is given by

$$\frac{d\varphi(i,y)}{dy} + \inf_u [c(i,y,u) + \sum_{j\neq i} \lambda_{ij}(y,u)\{\varphi(j,0) - \varphi(i,y)\}] = \alpha\varphi(i,y) \tag{5.1}$$

on $S \times [0,\infty)$. One important difficulty in handing with this differential equation is that it is non-local. It can be be shown via contraction principle argument that when $\alpha > 2M$, the value function V_α is the unique bounded, smooth solution of (5.1). In this case the infimum in (5.1) is realised at a stationary deterministic (non-relaxed) control which is optimal for the α-discounted cost criteria. But we have not been able to establish the existence of a solution to (5.1) when $\alpha \leq 2M$. Because we have not been able to solve the discounted case HJB for smaller values of α, we could not pursue the vanishing discount approach in finding a solution to the HJB equation for the average optimal case. In our problem the HJB equation for the average optimal case is given by

$$\rho = \frac{dh(i,y)}{dy} + \inf_u [c(i,y,u) + \sum_{j\neq i} \lambda_{ij}(y,u)\{h(j,0) - h(i,y)\}]\,. \tag{5.2}$$

It would be interesting to investigate an appropriate solution of 5.2 to study the average optimal case.

Finally, in this paper we have assumed that the jump rates and the cost function are bounded. If the jump rates are unbounded but satisfy a certain growth rate, then following the arguments in Chapter 8, Section 3 in [2], one can show that the controlled martingale problem for the operator

$$\mathcal{A}^{\mathbf{u}} f(i,y) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(i,y) + \sum_{j\neq i} \tilde{\lambda}_{ij}(t,y,\mathbf{u}(i,y))[f(j,0) - f(i,y)]\,. \tag{5.3}$$

is well-posed. For an unbounded cost, with an appropriate growth rate it may be possible to work in the space of continuous functions with weighted norms as in [7], [9] to derive analogous results.

References

[1] M. H. A. Davis, *Markov Models and Optimization*, Chapman and Hall, 1993.

[2] S. N. Ethier and T. G. Kurtz, *Markov Processes : Characterization and Convergence*, John Wiley and Sons, 1986.

[3] E. A. Finberg and A. A. Yushkevich, *Homogeneous controllable Markov models with continuous time and with a finite or countable state space* Toer. Veroyatnost. i Primenen 24 (1979), 155-160.

[4] A. Federgruen, A Hordijk and H. C. Tijms, *Denumerable state semi-Markov decision processes with unbounded costs, average cost criteria*, Stoch. Proc. and Appl. 9 (1979), 223-235.

[5] A. Federgruen, A Hordijk and H. C. Tijms, *Denumerable undiscounted semi-Markov decision processes with unbounded rewards*, Math. of Oper. Research 8 (1983), 298-313.

[6] M.K. Ghosh and A. Goswami, *Risk minimising option pricing in a semi-Markov modulated market*, SIAM J. Control Optim. 48 (2009), 1519-1541.

[7] X. Guo and O. Hernández-Lerma, *Continuous-Time Markov Decision Processes. Theory and Applications*, Springer-Verlag, 2009.

[8] X. Guo and O. Hernández-Lerma, *Continuous-time controlled Markov chains*, Annals of Applied Probability 13 (2003), 363-388.

[9] X. Guo, O. Hernández-Lerma and T. Prieto-Rumeau, *A survey of recent results on continuous-time Markov decision processes*, TOP 14 (2006), 177-261.

[10] A. Hordijk and F. A. Van Der Duyn Schouten, *Average optimal policies in Markov decision drift processes with applications to a queueing and a replacement model*, Advances in Applied Probability 15 (1983), 274-303.

[11] A. Hordijk and F. A. Van Der Duyn Schouten, *Discretization and weak convergence in Markov decision drift processes*, Mathematics of Operations Research, 9 (1984), 112-141.

[12] A. Hordijk and F. A. Van Der Duyn Schouten, *Markov decision drift processes; conditions for optimality obtained by discretization*, Mathematics of Operations Research 10 (1985), 160-173.

[13] N. Ikeda and S. Watanabe, *Stochastic Differential Equations and Diffusion Processes*, North Holland, 1989.

[14] S. R. Pliska, *Controlled jump processes*, Stochastic Processes and their Applications 3 (1975), 259-282.

[15] S. M. Ross, *Applied Probability Models with Optimization Applications*, Dover, 1992.

[16] K. Wakuta, *Arbitrary state semi-Markov decision processes with unbounded rewards*, Optimization 18 (1987), 447-454.